

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, and reconsideration and further examination of the subject application, in view of the amendments above and the remarks below, are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

By the above amendments, claims 1, 6-7, and 70 have been amended. Support for the subject matter added in claim 1 may be found in the specification such as at page, 6, lines 20-27; page 28, lines 12-16; and original claim 8. Claim 8 has been canceled.

The amendments should be entered and considered because they place the application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 3-7, 9-21, 47-50, and 70 will remain pending in the application. Each of these claims is under consideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 13-17, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,162,492 to Narayanan. Claims 10-12, 18-19, 47, and 49-50 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,891,562 to Rutz et al. ("Rutz"). And claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanan in view of GB 2,196,580 to Sakurai. For the following reasons, these rejections should be withdrawn.

Narayanan does not disclose or suggest each feature of the present invention, as set forth in representative claim 1. For example, Narayanan does not disclose or suggest using a substrate comprising one or more of a plastered wall, wallboard, particle board, lumber, wooden material or wooden-composite material used in the construction of dwellings or commercial buildings, concrete, or wallpaper. Narayanan only discloses paper on which writing or typing or drawings are made. There's no mention of any of the substrates recited in claim 1. Paper also does not qualify as any

Docket: 80021

PATENT

of the substrates recited in claim 1. As a result, Narayanan fails to disclose or suggest each feature of the present claims.

None of the secondary references of Rutz and Sakurai were cited to remedy this deficiency of Narayanan.

Accordingly, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness, much less one of anticipation. Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-7 and 70 were objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 6-7 and 70 have been rewritten in independent form. Therefore, they are now allowable.

Conclusion

In summary, Applicants believe the application to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection(s), remove all rejections, and pass the application to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Polly C. Owen

Polly C. Owen
Registration No. 44,991

August 4th, 2006
Date

Eastman Chemical Company
P.O. Box 511
Kingsport, Tennessee 37662
Phone: (423) 229-6204
FAX: (423) 229-1239

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Jodi L. Owenby
Jodi L. Owenby

August 4, 2006
Date